IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 2344 OF 2005

Mr. Keshavji Khemji Kania .. ... Petitioner

V/s.

Municipal Corporation of Gr. Bby .. Respondents
and ors.

Mr. M.P.S. Rao, Ms. Sheetal Sonpal i/b. K. Ashar &
Co. for petitioner.
Mr. V. Mahadik for respondents.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO &
ANOOP V. MOHTA,JJ.
DATED : 6th October, 2006

P.C.

. Rule. Heard forthwith.

2. It is not necessary for us to set out facts in detail. Considering the affidavit filed by Mr. Golwalkar A.M., Assistant Engineer (M. & E.), in para 4(e), it is set out that the petitioners applied for renewal of registration for a further period of three years showing one Mr. Bharat B. Parekh (Diploma Engineer) as a full time Electrical Engineer and same is revalidated up to 31.12.2007, after due scrutiny of paper and payment of requisite fees. In other words, really speaking, nothing survives in this petition. The learned counsel, however, points out that after 31.12.2007, just like in the present case, the petitioners were forced to come to this Court. We see

no reason as to why petitioners should be asked to come before this Court once again. The petitioners have now been granted renewal of registration based on the fact that they are eligible. After expiry of present period of 31.12.2007, we see no reason if petitioners apply and comply with the requirement, why their application for registration should not be renewed. It is only in the event that there is any amendment to the rule or intervening circumstances, that the respondents may have authority take any other decision.

3. With the above observations, the petition stands disposed of.

[F.I. REBELLO, J.]

[ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.]